

PATENT
C4-1114 (336-18)

REMARKS

Claims 89-91 and 93-123 are pending in this application after this Amendment. Claims 89-123 are rejected. Claim 92 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

As an initial matter, claims 118-123 have been amended to recite the dependency of these claims from claim 114.

Claims 90 and 91 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states (on page 2) that the recitation in claim 90 that a "video segment is recorded entirely before being retrieved by said PDA" and the recitation in claim 91 of a "pre-recorded video segment" were not found in the original specification. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

There is no requirement that the exact words or phrases recited in the claims appear in the specification. The only requirement is that the specification convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the statement in the Office Action that "these wordings were not found in the original specification" does result in the claims failing to convey possession of the claimed invention. Moreover, the specification clearly describes recording the video segment entirely before being retrieved by the PDA such that the pre-recorded video segment ends prior to the PDA retrieving the pre-recorded video segment. Specifically, this pre-recording is described from line 20 on page 12 to line 13 on page 13 of the application as filed. Applicants respectfully submit that this description (as well as others) shows possession to one skilled in the art of the claimed invention recited in claims 90 and 91. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 90 and 91 should be withdrawn.

PATENT
C4-1114 (336-18)

Claims 89-101 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0117638), hereafter Monroe 1, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Monroe 1 in view of Waehner et al. (U.S. Patent 7,136,513), hereafter Waehner. Claims 102-116 and 118-123 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe 1 or under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Patent 6,518,881), hereafter Monroe 2, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Monroe 1 in view of Monroe 2. Claim 117 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe 1 in view of Swanson, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,689,442), hereafter Swanson. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons set forth hereafter.

Independent claim 89 has been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claim 92 and recites a security system comprising, among other elements “an object recognition system coupled to said camera and configured to receive said video signal and detect objects, said object recognition system providing to a video recorder an identification signal based on a detected object to initiate recording by said video recorder of a segment of said video signal corresponding to said detected object” and “a portable personal digital assistant (PDA) wirelessly coupled to said object recognition system and said camera, said PDA configured to receive said identification signal and in response thereto provide a command signal to retrieve a recorded video segment.” Independent claim 114 has been amended to include subject matter similar to that recited in canceled claim 92 and recites a method of providing security information comprising, among other elements “storing a segment of said live video when an object is detected in the surveillance area and based on an identification signal indicating that said object matches a stored object”, “providing said identification signal to said PDA” and “communicating said stored video segment via the wireless connection to said PDA upon a request from said PDA based on said identification signal.” The cited prior art does not describe such a security system and method.

PATENT
C4-1114 (336-18)

As recognized in the Office Action (at page 5), and as described in Monroe 1, the system of Monroe 1 begins recording when motion within a field-of-view of a camera is detected. Thus, upon detection of motion, recording begins. In contrast, in the claimed invention, recording is initiated by a video recorder upon the object recognition system providing to the video recorder an identification signal based on a detected object. The recording is initiated in the claimed invention upon *detection by the objection recognition system* of an object and not based merely upon movement as in the system of Monroe 1. Accordingly, initiation of recording is based on different events. Moreover, as recording in the system of Monroe 1 is initiated upon the detection of motion, there is no need to initiate recording upon the detection of an object by an objection recognition system as recording is already ongoing. Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 89 and 114 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Further, Swanson fails to make up for the deficiencies of the other cited art with respect to the independent claims.

Dependent claims 90, 91, 93-101 and 115-123 are likewise allowable based at least on the dependency of these claims from the independent claims discussed above.

Additionally, the cited art does not describe a portable security device configured to collect non-image security data and transmit that data to an objection recognition system as recited in claim 102. The device of Monroe 2 may include a magnetic stripe reader capable of reading, for example, driver's license information. However, personal information acquired from a magnetic stripe of a driver's license is not the same as collecting non-image security data. Personal information and security type information is not the same. Moreover, the information read by the magnetic stripe reader of Monroe 2 is not used by an object recognition system, but instead is used for on-site processing, for example, for ticket payments. Accordingly, the prior art fails to describe the portable security device recited in claim 102.

PATENT
C4-1114 (336-18)

Dependent claims 103-105 further recite a proximity card detector. A magnetic stripe reader (see Office Action page 7) that requires contact with a magnetic stripe to read information is not the same as a proximity card detector that is specifically recited in claims 103-105.

Additionally, dependent claims 106-113 are also allowable based at least on the dependency of these claims from independent claim 102.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims also recite additional features that are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art neither anticipates nor renders obvious the claimed invention. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Evan Reno Sotiriou, Reg. No. 46,247
THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP
611 Olive Street, Suite 1611
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 584-4080